

1 MICHELE BECKWITH  
2 Acting United States Attorney  
3 DAVID L. GAPPY  
4 Assistant United States Attorney  
5 2500 Tulare Street  
6 Suite 4401  
7 Fresno, California 93721  
8 Telephone: (559) 497-4000  
9  
10 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
11 United States of America

7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9  
10 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
11 Plaintiff,  
12 v.  
13 THOMAS HENRY LOPEZ,  
14 Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:24-CR-00225-KES-BAM  
15  
16 STIPULATION FOR CONTINUANCE OF STATUS  
17 CONFERENCE AND ORDER  
18  
19 PROPOSED DATE: August 13, 2025  
20 TIME: 1:00 p.m.  
21 COURT: Hon. Barbara A. McAuliffe

22  
23 This case is scheduled for a status conference on June 11, 2025, before United States Magistrate  
24 Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe. Since the hearing was scheduled, the government has provided discovery  
25 that the defense is still reviewing. Some of that discovery has led to potentially greater criminal liability  
26 for the defendant in another judicial district. The defense has presented the government with  
27 information in support of a request for mitigation of consequences for his conduct. The defense also  
28 requests additional time for defense preparation and investigation. The parties also have had discussions  
about how the case might be resolved without a trial and would benefit from additional time to continue  
those discussions. Because this will likely involve another judicial district, the parties need additional  
time.

29  
30 Ends-of-justice continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the  
31 basis of [her] findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of  
32 the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is  
33 excludable unless “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or

1 finding that the ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of  
2 the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

3 Recently, the Ninth Circuit enumerated a “non-exhaustive” list of seven factors it found to be  
4 “relevant” in considering ends-of-justice Speedy Trial Act continuances. *United States v. Olsen*, 21  
5 F.4th 1036, 1047 (9th Cir. 2022). That non-exhaustive list includes: (1) whether a defendant is detained  
6 pending trial; (2) how long a defendant has been detained; (3) whether a defendant has invoked speedy  
7 trial rights since the case’s inception; (4) whether a defendant, if detained, belongs to a population that is  
8 particularly susceptible to complications if infected with the [COVID-19] virus; (5) the seriousness of  
9 the charges a defendant faces, and in particular whether the defendant is accused of violent crimes; (6)  
10 whether there is a reason to suspect recidivism if the charges against the defendant are dismissed; and  
11 (7) whether the district court has the ability to safely conduct a trial. *Id.*

12 In light of the factors above, this court should consider the following case-specific facts in  
13 finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-justice exception, §  
14 3161(h)(7). When continued, this court should designate a new date for the hearing. *United States v.*  
15 *Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be “specifically  
16 limited in time”).

17 Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant, by and  
18 through defendant’s counsel of record, accordingly stipulate as follows:

19 1. By previous order this matter was set for a status conference hearing on June 11, 2025.  
20 Since that hearing was scheduled, the defense has provided the government with information that it is  
21 still reviewing and considering. The defense also requests additional time for defense preparation and  
22 investigation. The parties will also benefit from having time to consider how the case might best be  
23 resolved.

24 2. By this stipulation, the parties agree that the next court date be on August 13, 2025. The  
25 parties also agree to exclude time between June 11, 2025, and August 13, 2025, under 18 U.S.C. §§  
26 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv).

27 3. The parties agree, and request that the Court find the following:

28 a) The defense requests additional time for defense preparation and investigation.

1 The government does not object to the continuance and joins in the request because its  
2 investigation has been continuing and it is also reviewing information that the defense recently  
3 provided to the government.

4 b) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the  
5 case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the  
6 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

7 c) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161,  
8 et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period from June 11, 2025, to August 13,  
9 2025, inclusive, is deemed excludable under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(1)(D), 3161(h)(7)(A) and  
10 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv) because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at the  
11 request of the parties on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking  
12 such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

13 4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the  
14 Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial  
15 must commence.

16 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

17 Dated: June 5, 2025

MICHELE BECKWITH  
Acting United States Attorney

19 /s/ David Gappa  
20 DAVID L. GAPPY  
21 Assistant United States Attorney

22 Dated: June 5, 2025

23 /s/ PETER JONES  
24 PETER JONES  
COUNSEL FOR  
THOMAS HENRY LOPEZ

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

THOMAS HENRY LOPEZ,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:24-CR-00225-KES-BAM

FINDINGS AND ORDER

PROPOSED DATE: August 13, 2025

TIME: 1:00 p.m.

COURT: Hon. Barbara A. McAuliffe

**FINDINGS AND ORDER**

The court has reviewed and considered the stipulation filed by the parties on June 5, 2025, and also reviewed the record of this case. For the reasons stated in the stipulation the court finds good cause for continuing the case from June 11, 2025, to, **August 13, 2025, at 1:00 p.m. before Magistrate Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe**. The status conference scheduled for June 11, 2025, is vacated. The court also finds that the time between June 11, 2025, and August 13, 2025, under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(1)(D), 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv) shall be excluded from Speedy Trial Act time calculations. However, in any request for a continuance, the parties shall explain when they will be ready to set a trial date.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 6, 2025

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE